

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated April 3, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 14-17 were pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 14-17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein, and claims 18-24 have been added. No new matter has been introduced by the new claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

At the outset, the Applicants thank Examiner Phantana Angkool for granting the telephone interview (hereafter “interview”) with the Applicants’ representative on June 25, 2009. During the interview, the distinguishable features between the present invention and the cited prior art were discussed in detail. Additionally, new claim 18 (as an exemplary independent claim) was also discussed.

It was noted that the present invention (as recited in new claim 18) is characterized by displaying, in the guidance display region, a single guidance content synthesized from two guidance contents, which allows saving space within the screen region. Thus, in a device in which the guidance display device of the present invention is implemented, it is possible to produce a more advantageous effect when the device has a smaller screen region.

It was also noted that Arend discloses displaying in different display regions, a guidance corresponding to each of the display regions. Although displayed on the same general screen, the separate guidance in Arend (e.g., 212, 214, 216 and 220) is not synthesized or combined in any way, but remains separate. In other words, unlike the present invention, Arend does not disclose or suggest synthesizing or combining, into one guidance content, first and the second guidance contents for operating the data in first and second display regions and then displaying the synthesized guidance content in a guidance display region other than the first and second display regions.

At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner suggested clarifying independent claim 18 to point out in more detail the features emphasized above (i.e., during the interview), which would help to distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, claims 14-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arend et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0230914, hereafter “Arend”).

As noted above, claims 14-17 have been canceled thereby rendering the above prior art rejections to those claims moot. Additionally, the Applicants assert that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in new independent claims 18 and 24. New claims 18-24 have also be further clarified, as suggested by Examiner. For example, independent claim 18 recites the following features:

“[a] guidance display device which holds a first display region for displaying first display data, a second display region for displaying second display data, and a guidance display region for displaying a guidance content, said guidance display device comprising:

a guidance display unit configured to display, in the guidance display region, a synthesized or combined guidance content which is synthesized or combined from a first guidance content for operating the first display data within the first display region and a second guidance content for operating the second display data within the second display region, the first guidance content corresponding to the first display region, the second guidance content corresponding to the second display region, and the guidance display region being separate from the first and second display regions.”

The features noted above in independent claim 18 are similarly recited in independent claim 24. Specifically, independent claim 24 is a corresponding method claim reciting steps directed to the features of the device of independent claim 18. Additionally, the features noted above in independent claim 18 (and similarly recited in independent claim 24) are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure.

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 18 and 24) is distinguishable over the cited prior art in that the device and method of the present invention provide a guidance display which can appropriately display guidance display content in an efficient way according to changes in operational specifications and so on. The present invention can achieve such an object by synthesizing or combining first and second guidance display contents in a guidance display region that is separate from the first and second display regions, which allows saving space within the screen region. Thus, it is possible to produce a more advantageous effect when the device has a smaller screen region.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Arend for disclosing or suggesting all the

features of the present invention. However, the Applicants assert that Arend fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of independent claims 18 and 24.

As noted during the interview, Arend discloses displaying in different display regions, a guidance corresponding to each of the display regions. Although displayed on the same general screen, the separate guidance content disclosed in Arend (e.g., 212, 214, 216 and 220) is not synthesized or combined but remains separate. In other words, unlike the present invention, Arend does not disclose synthesizing or combining, into one guidance content, first and the second guidance contents for operating the data in first and second display regions and then displaying the synthesized guidance in a guidance display region other than the first and second display regions. Additionally, Arend does not disclose or suggest a guidance display region for displaying the synthesized guidance content that is separate from the first and second display regions.

Conversely, the present invention (as recited in new claim 18) is characterized by displaying, in the guidance display region, a single guidance content synthesized from two guidance contents, which allows saving space within the screen region. Additionally, the guidance display region is separate from the other display regions.

Based on the above discussion, independent claims 18 and 24 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Arend. Additionally, claims 19-23 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Arend at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 18.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideaki YAJIMA et al.
/Mark D. Pratt/
By 2009.07.06 13:58:59 -04'00'
Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 6, 2009